UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/596,416	10/596,416 06/13/2006 Akimitsu Tsuda		1176/306	6382
46852 LIU & LIU	7590 04/20/201	EXAMINER		
	R STREET, SUITE 17	CHIEN, LUCY P		
LOS ANGELES	5, CA 900/1	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2871		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/20/2010	ELECTRONIC

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

wliu@liulaw.com julien@liulaw.com docket@liulaw.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/596,416	TSUDA, AKIMITSU		
Examiner	Art Unit		
LUCY P. CHIEN	2871		

	LUCY P. CHIEN	2871	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 05 April 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR A	LOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apper for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Coperiods:	the same day as filing a Notice of a replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or ( MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07( Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE f). on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 tension and the corresponding amount whortened statutory period for reply original.	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FII 36(a) and the appropriate of the fee. The appropriate nally set in the final Office	on.  LED WITHIN TWO  e extension fee ate extension fee ae action; or (2) as
set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL	•	-	·
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to (a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below).	nsideration and/or search (see NOī w);	ΓE below);	
<ul> <li>(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or</li> <li>(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a content of the present additional claims without canceling a content of the present additional claims without canceling a content of the present additional claims without canceling a content of the present additional claims without canceling a content of the place the application in bet appear and the present of the place the application in bet appear and the place the</li></ul>			ne issues for
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			
<ul> <li>4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12</li> <li>5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li> </ul>		mpliant Amendment (l	PTOL-324).
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).	·	•	-
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  Claim(s) allowed:  Claim(s) objected to:  Claim(s) rejected: 1-20.		l be entered and an e:	xplanation of
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:  AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	ıl and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but Applicant's arguments that Yuichi does not teach the condiscloses [0026-0029] that the control signal for controlling	ntrol of the light source in accordan	ce with the display mo	ode. Yuichi
therefore the controller selects to either illuminate the m switch means for switching the power supply to the light has to be illumination so that the displays can be feature the use opening and closing the cell phone	ain lighting regin or the mode of illi source according to the mode sele	munitaing the sub ligh	ting region,and ect means. There
<ul><li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (</li><li>13. ☐ Other:</li></ul>	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		

**Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303)** 

/David Nelms/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2871 Lucy P Chien Examiner Art Unit: 2871 Application No.

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06)

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Part of Paper No. 20100414